

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-57 are pending in the application. Claims 1-26 and 34-56 have been withdrawn. Claims 27 and 33 are herein amended. Claim 58 is herein cancelled. No new matter has been added.

Support for newly amended claim 27 may be found in the as-originally filed specification, for example see page 46, lines 13-18 and page 16, line 20. Further to the recitations that R<sup>6</sup> represents an alkyl group having 1 carbon atom and the imide resin does not include a repeating unit represented by General Formula (2) where R<sup>6</sup> represents a hydrocarbon group having 2 or more carbon atoms, Applicants have excluded species that they had possession of in favor of one specie. The specification, having described the whole, necessarily described the part remaining. See *Johnson and Farnham*, 194 USPQ 187, 194 (CCPA 1977). That is, since Applicants had possession of imide resins with R<sup>6</sup> representing an alkyl group having 1, 2, 3, 4, ... 18 carbon atom, Applicant also had possession of R<sup>6</sup> representing an alkyl group having 1, ~~2, 3, 4, ...~~ 18 carbon atom. (Above 18 being already excluded by the original language).

Claim 33 is also herein amended for clarification.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 27-33, 57 and 58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Maurer et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The presently claimed polarizer-protective film includes an imide resin and has a thickness which falls within the range from 20 µm to 300 µm. In contrast, Maurer et al., which

discloses in each of Examples 1 and 2 a compression molded plaque prepared from an imide resin, states that the compression molded plaque had a thickness of 3.2 mm; *i.e.*, 3200  $\mu\text{m}$ . See Maurer et al., Col. 11, line 65 – Col. 12, line 21. Hence, the presently claimed polarizer-protective film is completely different from the compression molded plaque of Maurer et al., at least with regards to thickness. Thus, Maurer et al. does not render anticipated the presently claimed polarizer-protective film.

The presently claimed polarizer-protective film has an extremely small thickness as defined in claim 1. On the other hand, Maurer et al. is directed towards a substrate for use in the preparation of an optical disk. A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would naturally understand that such a substrate is larger in thickness than a film for a polarizer-protective film. Thus, the presently claimed polarizer-protective film is novel from Maurer et al. in intended thickness and is novel from Maurer et al. in actual thickness as a result. Therefore, the thickness feature of the presently claimed polarizer-protective film is not anticipated by the disclosure of Maurer et al.

Furthermore, in the imide resin of the presently claimed polarizer-protective film, the imide resin feature does not include a repeating unit represented by General Formula (2) where  $\text{R}^6$  represents a hydrocarbon group having two or more carbon atoms. In other words, the imide resin of the presently claimed polarizer-protective film does not contain a higher methacrylate ester. In contrast, the methacrylate ester component (which corresponds to a repeating unit represented by General Formula (2), which is included in the imide resin of the presently

claimed polarizer-protective film) contained in the polymer of the examples of Maurer et al. requires a higher methacrylate ester other than methyl methacrylate. See Maurer et al., Col. 10, line 34-Col. 11, line 5.

Also, the product disclosed in Maurer et al. necessarily includes a higher methacrylate ester. The materials of the product include a higher methacrylate ester and methylmethacrylate to be mixed with each other. Thus, the intermediate, i.e., copolymer compound, disclosed in Maurer et al. necessarily includes a higher methacrylate ester. See Maurer et al., Col. 10, line 34 – Col. 11, line .5. See also Maurer et al, Examples. Furthermore, the methacrylate of Maurer et al. is used as a reaction auxiliary. Maurer et al. discloses that this compound is preferably small, rather than large, in content. See Maurer et al., Col. 10, line 65. In contrast, the presently claimed invention, which does include methacrylate, does not include a higher methacrylate ester. For at least these reasons, the presently claimed invention is not rendered anticipated by the intermediate disclosed in Maurer et al.

Therefore, the subject matter of claim 27 of the present application is novel from Maurer et al. In addition, the subject matter of each of claims 28 to 33 and 57, all of which depend from claim 27, is novel from Maurer et al.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is allowable and ask that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be reconsidered and withdrawn. Applicants respectfully submit that this case is in condition for allowance and allowance is respectfully solicited.

Application No.: 10/581,267  
Art Unit: 1787

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.116  
Attorney Docket No.: 062455

If any points remain at issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the local exchange number listed below.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,  
**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**

/BERNADETTE K. MCGANN/

Bernadette K. McGann  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 65-127  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

BKM/bam